

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended, claim 5 has been cancelled and claim 7 has been added.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 4 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller, U.S. Patent No. 5,061,923. Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish from the prior art and overcome the Examiner's rejection. More specifically, the limitation "an input cancellation unit for canceling a **single** input digit of the identification information" has been added. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendment. Support for the amendment is found on page 15, lines 3-6 where the specification states that "...operation on the corresponding digit **and/or** all the digits is cancelled."

Miller does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 1. More specifically, Miller does not teach "an input cancellation unit for canceling a single input digit of the identification information." In rejecting claim 5 below, the Examiner admitted that Miller does not explicitly disclose an input cancellation unit. Thus, Miller does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 1. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an input cancellation unit to allow the operator to correct an input error. However, in response to Applicant's arguments from Amendment A, the Examiner stated that


the claimed limitation in original claim 5 was not limited to the cancellation of a single digit. Thus, it appears from the Examiner's statement that the Examiner implied that a limitation directed towards the cancellation of a single digit would not be obvious and therefore patentable.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, U.S. Patent No. 5,061,923. Claim 5 has been cancelled.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33837.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Michael W. Garvey – Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: October 11, 2005